DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 918 CG 015 656

AUTHOR	Lott, Bernice; And Others
TITLE	Assessment of Sexual Harassment within the University of Rhode Island Community.
INSTITUTION	Rhode Island Univ., Kingston.
PUB DATE	Aug 80
NOTE	60p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for Women in Psychology (8th, Boston, MA, March 5-8, 1981).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Age Differences; *Aggression; Attitude Measures; *College Environment; College Students; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Rape; *Sex Differences; Sexuality; Student Attitudes; *Victims of Crime
IDENTIFIERS	*Sexual Harassment

ABSTRACT

In 1979, reports of sexual harassment and accusations of sexual assault at the University of Rhode Island led to the formation of a Sexual Harassment Committee. One of the tasks undertaken by a subgroup of this committee was a survey of the university community to identify actual experiences of and the attitudes of student and staff toward sexual harassment. From 927 responses, 172 individuals cited cases of sexual harassment which had happened to someone they knew. Of the 55 reported cases of personal sexual assaults, 95% were experienced by women, mostly undergraduates. Men were more tolerant than women of sexual harassment. In general, younger persons were more accepting than older persons. Many persons believed such behavior was "a part of life." (The appendices contain the survey instrument and the transcript of an act relating to rape and seduction developed by the state of Rhode Island General Assembly.) (Author/JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212918

ASSESSMENT OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND COMMUNITY

Report of an Investigation by The Assessment Task Group of the Sexual Harassment committee

University of Rhode Island
August 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bernice Lott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 015656

Members of the Task Group: Bernice Lott, Professor of Psychology and Chairperson of Task Group
Mary Ellen Reilly, Associate Professor of Sociology
Rod Crafts, Direstor of Student Relations
Wendy Howard, Undergraduate
Dale Howard, Undergraduate
Joan Mahoney, Catholic Chaplain

Acknowledgements

This report of the investigation conducted by the Task Group was written by Bernice Lott and Mary Ellen Reilly who take full responsibility for its contents and style.

The following persons contributed to various phases of the study and are very gratefully acknowledged: Amy Shavelson and Dale Howard, our student assistants who patiently and efficiently collected, recorded, coded, and filed all returned surveys; bill Zwick who served as our able and responsible computer consultant; Al Lott who graciously consented to function as one of the interviewers along with members of the Task Group; Bertha Coombs who kept us from spending too much money and helped us with important personnel and financial matters; Patrice Brierty who supplied us with all of our personnel lists; Cathy Jacob and Tony Zambarano who arranged delivery of the students' lists; the staff of the Administrative Computer Center who produced the address labels for the population; Eleanor Bousquet who gave us some useful studies; Del Glover and Beth Underwood who skillfully and speedily typed this report; and Frank Newman who funded us.

We are, finally, most grateful to all those members of the URI community who sat down to read our survey and who took the trouble to answer our questions. We have tried to extract from what was told to us information which will help us to better understand ourselves and how we live and work together. We hope that those who responded to the questionnaire will find this report especially significant and be pleased that they had a part in making it possible. We learned a great deal from those persons who agreed to be interviewed, and acknowledge their very special assistance with much thanks.

Assessment of Sexual Harassment Within the URI Community

Introduction

In the fall of 1979 members of the URI community and citizens of the state of Rhode Island were shocked and dismayed by reports of sexual harassment which came from the university. There were accusations of sexual assault; charges brought before the University Judicial System; grand jury indictments and subsequent trials; and a great deal of discussion of the general climate within the university in regard to relations between the sexes. Stories were told, privately and publicly, of sexual insults, intimidation, and attacks.

Such reports had begun to circulate on the campus earlier. During the previous year the Great Swamp Gazette had printed a story about a Professor X who allegedly lured a student off campus for sexual purposes. Lyn Farley, author of Sexual Shakedown, had spoken on campus and provoked discussion and revived memories of the sexual harassment experienced by many women in employment situations. In response to questions, complaints, and the need for review of the general issues involved, a Sexual Harassment Committee was formed at the initiative of Dr. Sylvia Feldman, URI's Affirmative Action Officer. One of the tasks which a subgroup of this Committee decided to undertake was a survey of the entire university community to find out directly about experiences of harassment on the campus and in the prior history of students, faculty and staff.

This report is a consequence of that survey. It is presented in the interest of providing some answers to those of us who are concerned with the questions raised, as well as to those who have not yet shown concern but may do so as a result of what is to be learned from our investigation.

Method

The Questionnaire

Our objective was to obtain as much information as possible about personal experiences, perceptions of the campus situation, and attitudes toward sexual harassment without overburdening our respondents. We also wished to minimize ambiguity by phrasing questions which utilized clearly defined concepts. We began, therefore, by delineating the area of our concern as a continuum of behavior ranging from physical sexual assault at one extreme, through intimidation (threat or bribery), and encompassing verbal and non-verbal sexual insults on the other end.

We examined a number of questionnaires* which had been recently devised for use on campuses or among employees of large organizations/industries. From these we borrowed ideas and questions, but decided to utilize definitions embodied in Rhode Island law wherever possible. In January of 1979, the Rhode Island legislature had passed a new Sexual Assault statute after much debate and discussion. It is in many ways a model of contemporary, progressive legislation in this area, and from it we took our definition of sexual assault as involving forced sexual contact without consent, separable into touching or penetration. Each of the key terms is defined as unambiguously as possible within the questionnaire, using the Rhode Island law as our model. A copy of this law is attached in Appendix B.

---

* We are grateful to the following persons who generously permitted us to profit from their work:
Elizabeth A. Stanko, Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Clark University; Donna Meeks, Everywoman's Center, University of Massachusetts/Amherst; Donna Benson, Associated Students, University of California/Berkeley; D. C. Commission for Women, Government of the District of Columbia; Janice DiGirolamo, AFSCME Illinois, Council 31; E. L. Johnson, Coordinator, Women's Activities, AFSCME.

A copy of our nine page survey instrument is given in Appendix A. Pretesting indicated that the average respondent would require 30 minutes to complete it. The questions contained in the survey may be generally categorized as dealing with the following subjects: demographic information (age, university status, etc.); respondent's personal knowledge of others on the U.R.I. campus who had been sexually assaulted; respondent's own experience of assault on the campus; respondent's own experience of sexual assault anywhere; respondent's actual and potential experience as a sexual assaulter; knowledge of sexual intimidation experienced by others on campus; personal experience of intimidation on the campus; experience of having been offered sexual contact in exchange for job or school related benefits; opinions about the frequency of sexual insult on and off the campus; personal experience of sexual insult; and finally a series of attitudinal questions (to be answered along a five-point scale) which constituted a Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory.

In all cases questions were designed to be applicable to the experiences of both women and men; and questions dealing with URI relate to any of its campuses, as is noted in relevant items.

The Sample

The population of concern in this investigation was the entire URI community, including students (undergraduate and graduate) and all full-time employees (faculty, administrators, staff) at both the Kingston* and Providence campuses. In January 1980 when this study was launched, the total number of persons in this population was 13,617. A decision was made to sample 14 - 15% of this population, broken down into 12 categories by university status.

Within each status category (e.g., classified non-union employees, Kingston undergraduates, etc.), a 14% sample was randomly selected by choosing every seventh name from a list provided by the Personnel Office or the Registrar.

---

*Kingston is used to refer to both the Kingston campus and the Bay campus.

Table 1 presents the number of persons sampled in each status category and the proportion of women and men within each of these categories (within the population and the sample).

It can be seen from Table 1 that undergraduate students constituted 67% of our sample, graduate students 13%, faculty 7%, and staff/employees 14%. This matches their representation in our population, i.e., the combined Kingston and Providence URI communities.

Of the 1954 persons sampled, 10 questionnaires were undeliverable by the post office to the address we had available, so that our actual sample consisted of 1944 persons.

Procedure

To each person selected within every status category (every seventh name), a questionnaire was mailed together with a cover letter of explanation which solicited cooperation and assured the respondent of anonymity (see Appendix A). No record was kept of persons to whom the surveys were mailed. A prepaid envelope was included in each mailing for convenient return of the completed questionnaires.

A separate sheet of paper was included with each survey on which interested persons could indicate their willingness to be interviewed; this was to be mailed directly to one of the investigators, separately from the completed questionnaire. Respondents were also supplied with the names and phone numbers of campus counselors if they wished "to talk confidentially with someone about any of the issues raised" in the survey.

All the surveys were mailed during the week of March 10, 1980. Two weeks later an advertisement was placed in the campus newspaper The Good 5¢ Cigar (and two items in the "Personals" columns) reminding those who had received the surveys to return them.

Table 1

Number of Persons in The Population and in The Sample
Categorized by University Status

URI Status	Population N	Sample N	Sample Proportion		Proportion[a] of Women	Proportion[a] of Men
Kingston Undergrads	8467	1217	.67	.62	.49	.51
Providence Undergrads	622	88		.05	.69	.31
Kingston Grads	1565	223	.13	.11	.44	.56
Providence Grads	212	30		.02	.41	.59
Faculty	861	128		.07	.28	.72
Non-Classified Staff	348	49		.02	.39	.61
Clerical Staff	448	64		.03	.97	.03
Classified-non-union	29	4		.002	.84	.16
Administration-union	227	32	.14	.02	.35	.65
Nurses	15	3		.002	1.00	.00
Council 94 Staff	650	92		.05	.37	.63
Technical Unit	173	24		.01	.54	.46
Total	13,617	1954			.48	.52

[a]These numbers indicate the proportion of women and men specific to each status category.

As returned questionnaires were received, each was given an identification number, processed, coded, and filed.

Persons who indicated a willingness to be interviewed were contacted individually by one of five interviewers familiar with the objectives of the investigation and the contents of the questionnaire. Interviews were in each case conducted by a same-sex interviewer who assured the interviewee that his or her questionnaire responses were unknown and that all interview material would be treated with complete confidentiality. Each interview was open ended and began with the simple question: what would you like to tell me about the issues dealt with in the survey?

Results of the interviews will be reported following the results obtained from the questionnaires.

Results

Survey Respondents

Of the 1944 deliverable questionnaires mailed to our sample, 927 were returned with some portion of the questions answered. This constitutes a return of 47.7% which is a high rate for mailed questionnaires of this length. We do not, of course, know how those who chose not to return their surveys differed from those who did. We assume that our respondents were more interested in the issues of this investigation and/or more willing to be cooperative, but beyond this we can only treat the answers we obtained from our 927 respondents at face value and examine how well they represented the sample in terms of such characteristics as sex and university status.

Sex. Of the total number of respondents, 919 identified their sex: 542 females and 377 males, or 59% and 41%, respectively. These percentages are wide departures from the percentages of women and men included in the

sample (48% female and 52% male), as previously shown in Table 1. Significantly more women (and fewer men) completed questionnaires than their proportionate share within the sample (Critical Ratio = 5.5, $p < .001$).

Age. The question on age was answered by 909 respondents. Table 2 presents this information by four age categories, separately for women and men.

Table 2

Age of The Respondents

Age Group	Women N	Women Proportion	Men N	Men Proportion	Total N	Total Proportion
Younger than 24	335	.62	199	.53	534	.59
24-33	113	.21	103	.28	216	.24
34-43	52	.10	35	.09	87	.10
44 and older	36	.07	36	.10	72	.08
Total	536		373		909	

A majority of the respondents (59%), as was predictable from the large number of students in the sample, were 23 or younger and only 18% were 34 or older. Among the female respondents, 62% were 23 years old or younger, while the comparable figure was 53% among the male respondents. It is apparent from these data and from the other figures shown in Table 2 that more younger women responded relative to men. This sex difference in age of respondents is statistically significant (Chi-Square = 9.52, df = 3, $p < .05$).

University Status. Respondents were categorized into six groups of reasonably good size, on the basis of their answers to a question about their status at the university. In order to protect the anonymity of respondents, highly specific status identifications (e.g., nurse) were not requested in the questionnaire. Furthermore, certain related categories were combined to allow for more meaningful statistical analysis since in some cases the number of respondents in a particular status was low. Table 3 indicates the total number and the number of female and male respondents (of the 899 who answered the question) in each of six status groups.

Is the relative proportion of respondents in the various status groups similar to the proportion of these groups in the sample? In answering this question, it is important to bear in mind that the information on status presented in Table 3 is information supplied by the respondent, i.e., it is a self-classification, whereas the sample as shown in Table 1 was drawn from lists of persons with official (institutional) status designations. The staff categories shown in Table 3, therefore, are broader than those in Table 1; all staff member respondents (other than faculty) are designated as clerical/technical or professional/administrative on the basis of their self identifications (see Appendix A, question C).

Table 3

University Status of The Respondents

Status Groups	Number of Persons Women	Men	Total N	Prop.
Kingston Undergraduates	344 (.63)[a]	205 (.37)	549	.61
Providence Undergraduates	49 (.77)	15 (.23)	64	.07
Graduate Students (Kingston & Prov.)	54 (.47)	62 (.53)	116	.13
Clerical, Technical, other staff	46 (.84)	9 (.16)	55	.06
Professional Staff, Administrators	23 (.49)	24 (.51)	47	.05
Faculty	18 (.26)	50 (.74)	68	.08
Total	534 (.59)	365 (.41)	899	

[a] The numbers in parentheses indicate the proportions of women and men in each status group.

It can be seen from Table 3 that 61% of all the respondents were Kingston undergraduates; in the sample they constituted 62% (1217 of 1954 persons, as can be seen in Table 1). Similar comparisons between the data given in the two tables reveal the following: Providence undergrads made up 7% of the respondents and 5% of the sample; graduate students (Kingston & Providence combined) made up 13% of both the respondents and the sample; faculty constituted 8% of the respondents and 7% of the sample; and all staff personnel comprised 11% of the respondent group and 14% of the sample. It is clear that the persons who responded are very representative of the sample, at least in terms of their positions within the university. The correspondence between group proportions in the respondent and sample groups is remarkably close; the Providence undergraduates are slightly overrepresented among respondents while non-faculty staff persons are slightly underrepresented.

A second question is whether the proportion of responding women and men within each of the status groups matches their proportion within the sample. A comparison between figures in Tables 1 and 3 again provides the basis for an answer. Among the Kingston undergraduates who returned their questionnaires were 63% women and 37% men compared with 49% women and 51% men to whom they were sent. This sizable difference, indicating greater responsiveness to the survey among the women, is statistically significant (Critical Ratio = 7.0, $p < .001$). Providence undergraduate women also responded in a number greater than their proportionate share of the sample, while the comparable men responded disproportionately less (77% versus 69% for the women; 23% versus 31% for the men), but this difference is not a statistically reliable one. The proportions of responding graduate student women and men and faculty women and men conform well to their respective proportions in the sample (.47 and .43 for graduate women, .53 and .57 for graduate men; .26 and .28 for women faculty, and .74 and .72 for the faculty men).

Comparisons within specific staff groups are difficult to make but it appears that, as among the faculty, the percentages of women and men respondents matches the percentages in the sample. It is primarily (although not entirely) the undergraduate women who account for the greater overall response rate of the women than the men.

Years at URI. Of the 542 women and 377 men who answered this item, 25% of the former and 24% of the latter had been at URI for less than one year, 46% of females and 40% of males had been at URI between one and three years, 19% and 22%, respectively, had been at URI for four to six years and 10% of the women and 15% of the men had been at URI for seven or more years. It is apparent that there is a difference between the female and male respondents, the latter tending to have been at URI longer. The overall sex difference on this variable is a statistically significant one (Chi-Square = 8.03, df = 3, $p < .05$).

Marital Status. Among the 542 women who indicated their marital status, 70% were single and never married, 7% were separated, divorced or widowed, and 23% were married. Of the 375 men who responded to this question, 64% were single (never married), 4% were separated or divorced (none was widowed), and 32% were married. The difference in marital status between the women and men is also statistically reliable (Chi-Square = 12.84, df = 2, $p < .01$).

Summary. All data consistently indicate that proportionately more younger, undergraduate women, relative to men, responded to the questionnaire, whereas among older and married persons, who had been at the University longer, men are more represented than women.

Sexual Assault

Personal knowledge of assault at URI, of someone other than oneself. A series of questions elicited information on this issue. Sexual assault was defined as sexual contact through the use of force, threatened force

or a weapon, without consent, as inferred from refusal, helplessness, or incapacitation. Two categories of assault were separately investigated: that involving forced touching of intimate body parts and that involving penetration (vaginal, anal or oral). The reader is referred to Appendix A (page 2) for the precise wording of relevant questions.

Table 4 presents the obtained data. It can be seen that 172 respondents cited cases of sexual assault which they knew occured on the URI campus to someone other than themselves. Of this number, some respondents cited more than one instance, but 122 persons cited at least one. Of the total number of 927 respondents, therefore, 13% (or one out of every eight persons) knew at least one person who had been sexually assaulted on the URI campus. What is not known and cannot be reasonably estimated is the number of cited cases which were reported by more than one respondent. We do not, in other words, know if all of the 172 cases are independent.

Women constitute the vast majority of those reported to have been assaulted (97%) and men the vast majority of assaulters (97%). In 25% of the cases cited, more than one assaulter was involved. Most reported assaults (77%) took place in or near residence halls, fraternities, sororities and other similar buildings; 8% were reported to have occurred in academic buildings, including the library.

Of the total number of forced touching assault cases (138) reported to have occurred to someone other than oneself, 98 (71%) were cited by women and 80 (58%) by undergraduate women on the Kingston campus. Similarly, most of the known instances of assault by penetration (34) were cited by women, 24 (71%), and 16 (47%) by Kingston undergraduate women specifically.

Personally experienced assault at URI. Another set of questions dealt with the respondent's own experiences (Appendix A, page 3). The data obtained are summarized in Table 5.

Table 4
Sexual Assaults at URI Known to Have Occurred to Someone Other Than Self

		Forced/Nonconsensual				Total Cases	
		Touching		Penetration		N	Prop.
Sex of Victim	Female	134	138	33	34	167	172 .97
	Male	4		1		5	.03
Sex of Assaulter	Female	5	135	0	33	5	168[a] .03
	Male	130		33		163	.97
No. of Assaulters	1	104	134	22	33	126	167[a] .75
	2 or more	30		11		41	.25
Location of Assault	in or near Fraternity	23	126	6	30	29	156[a] .19
	in or near Residence Hall	48		10		58	.37
	in or near Sorority	22		11		33	.21
	Car or Parking Lot	6		0		6	.04
	Pub area	7		0		7	.04
	Party/Dance	7		0		7	.04
	inside Office Class/Library	11		2		13	.08
	down-the-line Resid.	2		1		3	.02

[a] These numbers are not the same as the 172 known assaults since fewer respondents answered questions about sex of assaulter, number of assaulters, location of assault than about sex of victim.

Table 5
Sexual Assaults at URI Experienced by Respondents

		Forced/Nonconsensual Touching		Penetration		Total Cases N		Prop.
Sex of Victim	Female	41	44	11	11	52	55	.95
	Male	3		0		3		.05
Sex of Assaulter	Female	3	44	0	11	3	55	.05
	Male	41		11		52		.95
No. of Assaulters	1	38	42	11	11	49	53	.92
	2 or more	4		0		4		.08
Location of Assault	in or near Fraternity	13	40	1	11	14	51	.27
	in or near Residence Hall	11		8		19		.37
	in or near Sorority/or other	6		1		7		.14
	Pub area	4		1		5		.10
	Party/Dance	1		0		1		.02
	inside Office/ Class/Library	5		0		5		.10
Relationship of Assaulter(s)	Acquaintance	19	43	8	11	27	54	.50
	Co-worker	2		0		2		.04
	Friend	2		2		4		.07
	Date	3		1		4		.07
	Stranger	7		0		17		.31

Of the 55 instances of personally experienced sexual assault, 52(95%) were reported by women, who, in 50 cases, were assaulted by one or more men and in 2 cases by a woman. Of the three men who reported assaults, the assaulters were men in 2 instances and a woman in 1. Some persons reported having been sexually assaulted more than once; 42 persons were assaulted at least once. Of these 42 persons, 39 were women and 3 were men. Considering not the total number of sexual assaults reported, but the number of persons who reported being assaulted at least once at URI, we find 3 men, or .8%, out of 380 estimated male respondents (i.e., 41% of the total of 927) and 39 women, or 7.1%, out of 547 estimated female respondents (ie., 59% of 927) Based on respondent reports, the probability of a male member of the URI community being sexually assaulted is thus 1 out of 125 (.8%) and the probability of a female member of the URI community being sexually assaulted is, on the other hand, 1 out of 14 (7.1%).

The vast majority of the women reporting assaults were Kingston undergraduates, 30 of whom reported having been assaulted at least once, which is 71% of the total of such reports. If we compare the number of Kingston undergraduate women who reported being sexually assaulted at least once (30) with their total number in the respondent group (344) we find an assault rate of 8.7%, or 1 out of every 11 such women.

Most of the assaults reported (78%) took place in or near some campus residence; 10% in or near the pub; and 10% in an academic building. Half of all reported assaults were perpetrated by an acquaintance (i.e., a person known but not known well), 31% by a total stranger, and 18% by a coworker, friend or date. No other relationships were reported by respondents.

We asked persons who reported being assaulted to indicate with whom they had discussed the incident. Of the 27 who responded 4% had spoken to no-one, 78% had talked with a friend or roommate, 11% had talked with a coworker or some other person, but only 7% had reported the assault to the police.

Using this figure, it appears likely that allegations of assault known to the police must be multiplied by 14 in order to get a true estimate of the incidence of sexual assault at URI within the past few years.

Personally experienced sexual assault someplace other than at URI. Respondents were asked to relate their experiences of sexual assault (as defined previously) "anywhere outside of URI at any time" in their lives. The data obtained are shown in Table 6.

One can see that both men and women report having experienced more assaults off the campus than on it and that the risk for men is considerably greater off the campus. Whereas three cases of male victimization were reported on the URI campus (5% of all sexual assaults), 28 such cases were reported off the campus (12% of all sexual assaults).

The respondents reported 239 personally experienced sexual assaults at some time in their lives (excluding URI experiences); of these, women reported being victims 88% of the time and men, 12%, while women were assaulters 3% of the time and men, 96% of the time. Ninety-five percent of the cases involved one assaulter. The number of persons who reported being sexually assaulted at least once is less than the total number of assaults reported. Among the women, 161 reported at least one sexual assault at some time somewhere other than at URI; this is 29.4% of the female respondents or almost 1 out of every 3 women. Among the men, 20 reported at least one assault; this is 5.3% or 1 out of every 20 men.

If we examine the current university status of the women who reported at least one sexual assault, we find that 58% are Kingston undergraduates, 12% are Providence undergraduates, 15% are graduate students, and 5% each are staff workers, professional/administrators, and faculty. These percentages are close to the proportions of the groups within the respondent group (.64, .09, .10, .09, .04, and .03). Highest risk women appear to be Providence campus students and graduate students,

Table 6
Sexual Assaults Experienced Anywhere Outside of URI

		Forced/Nonconsensual Touching		Forced/Nonconsensual Penetration		Total Cases N		Total Cases Prop.
Sex of Victim	Female	163	189	48	50	211	239	.88
	Male	26		2		28		.12
Sex of Assaulter	Female	7	188	1	49[a]	8	237[a]	.03
	Male	181		47		228		.96
No. of Assaulters	1	177	187	48	50	225	237	.95
	2 or more	10		2		12		.05
Location of Assault	Auto/parking Lot	18	182	6	48	24	230	.10
	Residence of other	29		13		42		.18
	Victim's home	23		16		39		.17
	Outdoors	28		4		32		.14
	Bar	15		0		15		.07
	Work place	9		1		10		.04
	Public place/ transportation	15		1		16		.07
	Miscellaneous/ other	45		7		52		.23
Relationship of Assaulter	Acquaintance	37	187	9	48	46	235	.20
	Co-worker	6		1		7		.03
	Friend	10		5		15		.06
	Date	16		8		24		.10
	Stranger	83		9		92		.39
	Relative	20		7		27		.12
	Spouse	2		3		5		.02
	Person in authority	13		6		19		.08

[a] One case was reported in which there were two assaulters, one male and one female. This case was not included in either the F or M category.

but in general the number of women reporting sexual assault seems to be spread proportionately through all status groups.

Among the men who reported being sexually assaulted at least once, 42% are Kingston undergraduates (who constitute 56% of the male respondents). The high risk men are found among the professionals/administrtors and faculty who constitute 11% and 32%, respectively, of men who reported at least one sexual assault, whereas they are only 7% and 14% of the respondent group. Male Providence undergraduates constitute 5% of the assault reporting group and 4% of the respondents; male graduate students are 11% of the assault reporting group and 17% of the respondents; staff and other male workers, who made up 2% of the respondents, reported no assaults.

Location of assaults varied widely, but the largest number (35%) reportedly took place in a residence, the victim's or some other person's. No one location appears to be clearly more risky (or safer) than others. Assaulted persons report having been molested by strangers 39% of the time and by someone known to them 61% of the time; the latter category includes relatives (12%), dates (10%), persons in authority (8%) and others as listed in Table 6.

Persns who reported having been sexually assaulted were asked to whom they had talkedabout this experience. Answers were given for 153 incidents: 16% were discussed with no one; 43% were discussed with a friend or roommate; 1% with a lawyer; 3% with a physician; 29% with a parent, relative or spouse; 5% with some other person; and only 3% of the incidents were reported to the police. If this figure is representative of other groups of people (and there is little reason to think that it is not), this suggests that police figures on incidence of alleged assault are even more spuriously low than we think. The reader should keep in mind that respondents reported assault at various ages, by relatives, and spouses - incidents that are least likely to be reported to

the police. But even assault by strangers is far greater than the percentage reported to the police.

Respondents as sexual assaulters. Each person was asked to speculate about whether there were "any circumstances under which 'she or he' might sexually assault another person" if assured of no report or punishment (Appendix A, question I). Answers were given on a 5 point scale (Yes, many; yes, some; yes, few; perhaps; no). Table 7 summarizes the obtained responses, with the three "Yes" categories combined.

Table 7
Hypothetical Circumstances under which a Person Might Sexually Assault

	Women		Men		
	N	Proportion	N	Proportion	Total
Yes	4	.01	14	.04	18
Perhaps	5	.01	29	.08	34
No	498	.98	316	.88	814
	507		359		866

It can be seen from Table 7 that 12% of the 359 male respondents can conceive of some circumstance under which they might sexually assault another person, in contrast to 2% of the 507 women. This difference is a statistically reliable one (Chi-Square = 40.15, df = 2, $p < .001$).

Respondents were also asked if they had ever actually sexually assaulted another person. One woman (out of 516) responded affirmatively (.2%) in contrast with 7 men (out of 360), or 2%.

Sexual Intimidation

Personal knowledge of intimidation at URI of someone other than oneself. Sexual intimidation was defined (Appendix A, pg. 5) as "a threat or bribe by a person in a position of authority to coerce sexual contact", and examples

of such threats and bribes were provided.

Respondents cited 68 cases of which they had personal knowledge. In 93% of these cases, the intimidated person was female and in 94% of the cases the intimidator was male. Table 8 summarizes the information obtained relative to these incidents.

The largest number of incidents of intimidation of others were cited by Kingston undergraduates, 30 by women and 20 by men (i.e., 50 of the 68 reported, or 74%). It is, therefore, understandable that 58% of the threats or bribes had to do with grades or examinations. An additional 15% were job-related. As indicated in Table 8, 53% of the intimidations came from teachers, 8% from graduate assistants, 6% from staff members or administrators, 14% from employers and 14% from students.

Intimidation personally experienced by respondents at URI. Table 9 summarizes the responses obtained relevant to this area of inquiry. Only 12 incidents of sexual intimidation were reported as having been experienced by the respondents themselves. Of those who responded, 11 persons reported at least one such experience, 9 women (or 1.6% of the responding women) and 2 men (.5%).

It is clear that proportionately more women than men reported experiencing sexual intimidation (83% and 17%, respectively). Grades were involved in 25% of the cases and job factors in 17% of the cases. Teachers were the intimidators in 42% of the cases and students 25% of the time.

Respondents as intimidators. Of the 838 persons who answered the relevant question, only 4 women and 3 men admitted to having sexually intimidated someone at some time at URI. Of the 878 persons who responded to a subsequent question, 14 women (2.7%) and 11 men (3.1%) said that they had at some time sexually intimidated someone somewhere (not at URI).

Table 8
Sexual Intimidation at URI to Someone Other Than Self

		N	Total Cases	Proportion
Sex of Person Intimidated	Female	63	68	.93
	Male	5		.07
Sex of Intimidator	Female	4	68	.06
	Male	64		.94
Nature of Threat or Bribe	Job related	11	67	.16
	Grades/exams	39		.58
	Slander	2		.03
	Recommendation	2		.03
	Other	13		.19
Status of Intimidator	Teacher	35	66	.53
	Grad assistant	5		.08
	Staff member/ Administrator	4		.06
	Student	9		.14
	Employer	9		.14
	Other	4		.06

Table 9
Sexual Intimidation at URI Experienced by Respondents

		N	Total Cases	Proportion
Sex of Person Intimidated	Female	10	12	.83
	Male	2		.17
Sex of Intimidator	Female	2	12	.17
	Male	10		.83
Nature of Threat or Bribe	Job related	2	12	.17
	Grades/exams	3		.25
	Recommendation	1		.08
	Other	6		.50
Status of Intimidator	Teacher	5	12	.42
	Student	3		.25
	Employer	1		.08
	Other	3		.25

Respondents as potential recipients of sexual favors. Two questions asked how often respondents had "been offered sexual contact or sexual favors in exchange for some job related or school related benefit" that the respondent could provide in her or his position of authority. The first of these questions was specific to URI. Of 62 women who considered themselves to be in positions of authority at URI (in response to this question), 58 (94%) reported never being offered sexual favors and 4 (6%) reported rare offers. In contrast, 94 of 107 comparable men reported never being offered sexual contact (88%) and 13 (12%) reported offers of such contact from rarely to very often. The difference between the reported experiences of men and women on this dimension (at URI) is sizable but not statistically reliable.

With respect to reports of receiving offers of sexual favors elsewhere, outside of the campus, 239 women and 241 men judged themselves as having been in a position to provide benefits to someone else, i.e., to have been in a position of authority. Of these women, 15, or 6%, said they received offers of sexual contact very often, often, or occasionally; 20, or 8%, said they received them rarely; and the remaining 86% said they never received them. Of the men, 7 (3%), said they received sexual offers very often, often, or occasionally; 31 (13%) said they received them rarely; and 84% said never. The women and men do not differ significantly in the pattern of these reported experiences.

Respondents as offerers of sexual favors. Of 522 women who answered the question, only 4 (1%) said that they had ever "offered sexual contact or sexual favors in exchange for a job related or school related benefit" at URI. Of the 362 men who answered, 10 (3%) had offered such contact.

Outside of URI, 14 of 522 women (3%) said they had offered sexual favors in return for some job or school related benefit, while 13 of 365 men (4%) said the same. This difference between the sexes is not reliable.

Sexual Insults

A series of questions (Appendix A, questions S through X) were asked regarding sexual insult, defined as an "uninvited sexually suggestive, obscene or offensive remark, stare, or gesture."

On the Campus

Respondents indicated along a five-point scale (ranging from very often to never) how frequently they believed that men received sexual insults on the campus. Table 10 summarizes the answers obtained. Most respondents

Table 10
Believed Frequency with which Men are Sexually Insulted at URI

Frequency	Respondents: Female N	Female Prop.	Male N	Male Prop.	Total
Very often/Often	49	.09	34	.10	83
Occasionally	195	.37	146	.41	341
Rarely	245	.47	163	.46	408
Never	37	.07	14	.04	51
	526		357		883

(52%) believed that men rarely or never receive such insults on the campus; but 37% of the women and 41% of the men believed this occurs occasionally, and 9% of the women and 10% of the men that this occurs often or very often. The perceptions of women and men with respect to this issue are very similar and there is no reliable difference between their responses.

When respondents were asked to judge the extent to which women are sexually insulted on the campus, the results are quite different and women and men are found to make reliably different judgments (Chi-Square = 24.02, df = 3, $p < .001$). Table 11 summarizes these data.

Table 11
Believed Frequency with which Women are
Sexually Insulted at URI

	Respondents				
	Female		Male		
Frequency	N	Proportion	N	Proportion	Total
Very often	107	.20	36	.10	143
Often	193	.37	120	.34	313
Occasionally	192	.36	161	.45	353
Rarely or Never	36	.07	39	.11	75
	528		356		884

Proportionately more women than men believe that women are often or very often sexually insulted at URI (57% versus 44%), while proportionately fewer women than men believe that women are only occasionally insulted (36% versus 45%) or rarely or never insulted (7% versus 11%). It is of

considerable interest that the perception of women and men is so divergent with respect to women as targets of verbal harassment, whereas it is similar with respect to the issue of men as targets.

Respondents were also asked about their own personal encounters at URI. Table 12 summarizes responses to the question regarding the experience of sexual insult from a man or group of men. Not surprisingly, women's reported experiences have been extremely and reliably different from men's (Chi-Square = 244.63, df = 3, $p < .001$). Only 30% of the women reported never being sexually insulted by a man at URI whereas 13% reported being insulted often or very often and 27% reported being insulted occasionally. In contrast, 82% of the men reported never being sexually insulted by another man.

Of the women who reported being sexually insulted by men at URI occasionally, often or very often, the vast majority (79%) are undergraduates. Similarly, of the men who reported being sexually insulted by men at URI often or occasionally, most are undergraduates (67%). These percentages are greater than the proportion of the respondent group which undergradute women and men constitute (combining Kingston and Providence students): .74 of the female respondents and .60 of the male respondents, respectively.

Table 12
Frequency with which Women and Men Reported Being Sexually Insulted by Men at URI

	Respondents				
	Female		Male		
Frequency	N	Proportion	N	Proportion	Total
Very often/Often	70	.13	1	.00	71
Occasionally	147	.27	16	.04	163
Rarely	157	.29	48	.13	205
Never	162	.30	294	.82	456
	536		359		895

Table 13 summarizes the answers obtained to the question regarding personal encounters with sexual insult from a woman. It is clear

Table 13
Frequency with which Women and Men Reported Being Sexually Insulted by Women at URI

	Respondents				
	Female		Male		
Frequency	N	Proportion	N	Proportion	Total
Very often/Often Occasionally	5	.01	32	.09	37
Rarely	45	.09	97	.26	142
Never	473	.90	244	.65	717
	523		373		896

that women are seldom sexually insulting to either men or to other women, but that the frequency with which this occurs differs reliably, as reported by women and men (Chi-Square = 89.42, df = 2, $p < .001$). Only 10% of the female respondents but 35% of the men reported ever being sexually insulted by a woman at URI, although this has been generally a rare experience for those who have encountered it. Of the persons who reported having been insulted by women, the largest number (76%) are undergraduate students. This is a larger percentage than that which undergraduates constitute within the total respondent group, i.e., 68%.

Sexual Insult Outside of URI

Women and men differ sharply and reliably in the frequency with which they reported being sexually insulted by men outside of URI (Chi-Square = 320.23, df = 3, $p < .001$). These data are shown inTable 14. It is the rare woman (10%) who reported never being sexually insulted by a man and the majority of the female respondents (57%) reported receiving such insults very often,

Table 14

Frequency with which Women and Men Reported Being Sexually Insulted by Men Outside of URI

	Respondents				
	Female		Male		
Frequency	N	Proportion	N	Proportion	Total
Very often/often	99	.18	5	.01	104
Occasionally	210	.39	25	.07	235
Rarely	172	.32	109	.30	281
Never	55	.10	220	.61	275
	536		359		895

often or occasionally. Among the male respondents, 30% reported that sexual insults from a man were rare and 61% reported never encountering them.

Undergraduate women made up 77% of those women who reported being sexually insulted by a man (outside of URI) occasionally, often, or very often; and undergraduate men constituted 59% of the men who reported being sexually insulted more than rarely.

Table 15 presents comparable data relevant to sexual insults by women. Again the responses of women and men are reliably different (Chi-Square = 75.44, df = 2, $p < .001$.) Whereas 76% of the women reported never being sexually insulted by a woman, and 21% reported rarely being insulted, 12% of the men reported being insulted by a woman occasionally or more often, 40% rarely, and 48% never. Although women do less sexual insulting than men, in general, men reported encountering such insults from women more frequently than women. Among the persons who reported being sexually insulted by a woman (outside of URI), 72% are undergraduate students (who make up 68% of the respondent group).

Table 15

Frequency with which Women and Men Reported Being Sexually Insulted by Women Outside of URI

	Respondents				
	Female		Male		
Frequency	N	Proportion	N	Proportion	Total
Very often, Often, Occasionally	18	.03	45	.12	63
Rarely	110	.21	148	.40	258
Never	395	.76	179	.48	574
	523		372		895

Consequences of Sexual Harassment for Employment

Respondents were asked how many times they had left a job "anywhere, because of sexual threats, bribes, or insults." Whereas 366 of 370 men (99%) reported never leaving a job for this reason, and 4 (1%) reported doing so at least once, 486 of 534 women reported never leaving a job because of sexual harassment, but 48 or 9% said they had. From these figures, one could conclude that one out of every 11 female respondents had voluntarily severed employment or been fired because of sexual harassment from an employer or other employee.

Very few respondents reported dropping a course at URI for this reason. Only 5 women and 2 men said that they had ever done so.

Attitudes toward Sexual Harassment

Eleven statements were presented at the end of the questionnaire (Appendix A, pg. 9), and respondents were asked to indicate the extent of agreement with each item on a 5-point scale (ranging from 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree). In Table 16, each statement is presented

along with the Mean response made by women and men, separately, and the probability that the difference between these Means is statistically significant.

Table 16

Mean Responses of the Women and Men to Attitudinal Statements regarding Sexual Harassment

Statement	Mean Score[a] Women[b]	Men[b]	p[c]
1. Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act, or dress.	3.59	3.04	< .001
2. An attractive woman has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.	3.18	2.58	< .001
3. Most men are sexually teased by many of the women with whom they interact on the job or at school.	3.69	3.37	< .001
4. A man must learn to understand that a woman's "no" to his sexual advances really means "no".	1.59	2.11	< .001
5. Uninvited sexual attention by men to women students or employees helps to keep women in their place.	4.66	4.43	< .001
6. It is only natural for a woman to use her sexuality as a way of getting ahead in school or at work.	4.55	4.10	< .001
7. An attractive man has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.	3.30	2.76	< .001
8. I believe that sexual intimidation is a serious social problem.	2.22	2.59	< .001
9. It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive.	3.41	2.73	< .001
10. Innocent flirtations make the workday or school day interesting.	2.92	2.57	< .001
11. Encouraging a professor's or a supervisor's sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to improve their work situation.	3.63	3.28	< .001

[a] The lower the score the greater the agreement with the statement.

[b] The number of women responding to each statement ranged from 534 to 537. The number of men ranged from 368 to 376.

[c] Differences between Means were analyzed by simple ANOVA.

It is immediately apparent that the women and the men have divergent attitudes on the general issue of sexual harassment. They differed significantly in the extent to which they agreed with all eleven of the statements. Although there was variation among women and among men, their average responses were, in every case, reliably different. A glance at the statements and the Mean scores of the women and men indicates that in every case the men are more tolerant, and the women are less tolerant, of sexual harassment. Men see it as more natural, as more to-be-expected, and less problematic and serious than women.

Because 10 of the 11 statements deal with tolerance for (i.e., acceptance of) sexual harassment, these were combined to form a single scale tentatively titled the Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory. Statement 5 was omitted, and statements 4 and 8 were recoded so that the tolerant or accepting response (disagreement) had a higher score than a nonaccepting response. Scores on the 10 statements were then summed for each respondent, and women and men were compared. The Mean score for 514 women (who responded to all 10 items) was found to be 36.44. For 354 men, the Mean was 31.63, a highly significant difference, indicating, on the scale as a whole, a greater acceptance of sexual harassment by men than women.

Acceptance of sexual harassment was also found to vary among the different age groups. The Mean scores on the 10 item Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory by age group are as follows: Younger than 24 (N = 517), Mean = 33.51; age 24 to 33 (N = 204), Mean = 35.72; age 34 to 43 (N = 77), Mean = 36.22; age 44 to 53 (N = 48), Mean = 35.98; age 54 and older (N = 20), Mean = 37.05. It is clear that among our respondents, there is a fairly steady progression in decreased acceptance of sexual harassment as one moves from younger to older persons. The overall difference among age groups (analyzed by simple ANOVA) is statistically

reliable ($p < .001$). That the older persons are primarily staff, faculty and graduate students while the younger persons are primarily undergraduate students indicates that these data reflect a significantly greater acceptance of sexual harassment among our students, who are also the persons who experience it most.

A direct look at the average scores of persons in the various status groups on the Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory indicates that, as the age data suggest, university status is reliably related to the extent of acceptance of sexual harassment ($p < .001$). Table 17 presents the Mean scores for our six status groups. The lower the score the greater is the acceptance of (or tolerance for) harassment. It is clear that Kingston undergraduates are the most accepting and faculty are the least accepting of harassment. Providence undergraduates who are typically considerably older than their peers in Kingston are similar in their views to graduate students and staff members. Professionals and administrators are less accepting than these persons but more accepting than faculty.

Table 17
Mean Scores on The Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory

University Status	N	Mean Score
Kingston undergraduates	531	33.81
Providence undergraduates	61	35.70
Graduate students	104	35.51
Clerical, technical,other staff	51	35.45
Professional, administrators	43	36.00
Faculty	65	36.78
Total	855	

Interview Findings

Of the 927 persons who returned their questionnaires, 61 volunteered to be interviewed by sending their names and phone numbers to one of the investigators. The names were divided into two groups of men (27 in total) and three groups of women (34 in total) and randomly assigned to one of five same-sex interviewers. The interviewers consisted of a chaplain, an administrator, and three faculty members, all of whom had considerable professional experience in one-to-one conversations with students and others.

Interviews were open-ended. A record was kept of the interviewee's name (the last name was subsequently marked over), sex, age, university status, and the date of the interview. Each interview began in much the same way; the volunteer was told that her or his interest in the investigation was appreciated and then asked "to comment further on the questions in the survey or on the general issue of sexual harassment."

Of the 34 women who said that they were willing to be interviewed, 3 could not arrange a convenient time, 2 did not keep their appointments, and 2 said, when contacted by phone, that they had "nothing more to add" to their survey responses. Personal interviews with the remaining 27 were completed, each lasting between 30 minutes to one hour.

Within the group of 27 interviewed women were: 20 Kingston and 1 Providence undergraduates, 2 graduate students, 3 faculty members, and 1 professional staff person. They ranged in age from 52 to 18, with the median age being 21.

Nine of the women reported at least one personal experience of sexual assault at some time during their lives. This number is 33% of the number of women interviewed, a percentage which is only slightly higher than, and quite consistent with, the 29.4% of women who reported such assaults (outside of URI) in the survey. Only one of these assaults was reported to the police.

These incidents, all by men, of forced sexual contact without consent were reported to have been perpetrated by: two strangers in the Providence Civic Center parking lot; a brother-in-law; a stranger who broke into an apartment; the family dentist; a great grandfather; a stranger in a parking lot outside a pub; an employer; the boy-next-door; and a friend's friend.

Interviewees also talked about assault and intimidation experienced by their female friends, roommates, or acquaintances. These tended to be specific to URI and included: the threat of poor grades by one instructor; the promise of a good recommendation by an adviser; an "overattentive" equipment attendant; being forced off the road and attacked by two men in another car after a student party; being insulted in class by a teacher whose advances were rejected; physical assault outside of Independence Hall by a stranger; physical attack on Fraternity/Sorority Circle of a student returning to her sorority; assault by two drunken students who came into an unlocked dorm room and wanted to "fool around" with the sleeping occupant; assault of a woman by her "date" who did not accept her "no"; offer by a graduate assistant for an A without the final examination; and amorous behavior toward a student by her professor. In every instance the assaulter or intimidator was male. Most of these cases were not reported to anyone in a position of authority; those that were did not result, in the opinion of the interviewees, in satisfactory solutions or punishment of the assaulter or intimidator.

Among the interviewees, most believed that a problem existed on the campus to about the same extent as it existed in American society generally, which, in their view, was considerable. Ten of the women, however, maintained that there was little sexual harassment on the campus, and that the publicized reports of alleged assault had been "blown out of proportion", that such matters were "not that much of a problem." As the interviews progressed, however, it became clear that the majority of the women (both those who said

initially that they were troubled by the frequency of sexual harassment on the campus and those who said initially that they were not) shared the general view that women must expect to be sexually approached, teased, insulted, and so on. The undergraduate women, especially, voiced over and over again the view that such behavior by men is the "way things are." One woman, a junior, said: "It's part of being a woman; I don't like it, but that's the way it is - with most men, anyway...I don't stop to think about it." A sophomore said: "You become used to it," and most women just "learn how to handle the situation...It's not fair but it's reality."

Some felt that the situation was contributed to by women who mistake sexist remarks and harassment for flattery. Many described drinking as an important antecedent of sexual assault; women at campus parties who get drunk were described repeatedly as easy prey or targets. "Drinking or pot is always involved," according to one Sophomore. If a woman doesn't leave some parties (particularly fraternity parties)by a certain time it is assumed that she has acceded to "spending the night" and having sexual relations. Interviewers heard many descriptions of the aftermath: the young woman wakes up guilty and disturbed, uncertain of what happened, but convinced that although she didn't want the sex, she was somehow to blame. Several of the young women believed that if a woman was assaulted while drunk, "it was probably her fault," she "deserved it."

Girls "get loosened up" at parties, said one student, and "guys take this as 'starting something' and get turned on." To refuse a man's sexual advances after a party in which liquor was available, especially at his expense, is to invite questions like "why'd you come?", and insults and anger. Many young women, the interviewers were told, want to avoid embarrassment and anger, and the man's feeling of rejection when he is "turned down." One student said: "I'd blame myself if I got into a vulnerable situation at a party. I wouldn't report it unless it was a stranger."

One senior described the situation as she sees it: "Man is the prowler and woman is the defender and the prey." Girls who tease, said another student, "deserve to be raped."

Many women commented on their coping strategies, how they deal with the sexual innuendos, insults, bribes and threats which most of the younger women accept as "part of life." They see, and accept, the responsibility for avoiding assault as primarily the woman's. Here is what the female students said they do: avoid going to parties (especially at fraternities); don't take harassment seriously, i.e., "ignore it;" don't let remarks bother you - laugh them off; learn not to tease and "not to go to a guy's room unless you expect to spend the night and have sex;" "turn an insult into flattery;" accept it. Primarily, the women said they must learn how "to handle themselves" in situations with men, and to "deal with" men's assumptions and expectations. It was a woman's responsibility not to get into trouble.

The older women tended to describe more assertive and more direct techniques for handling sexual put-downs, insults, and assumptions. These included: confronting the insulter; responding with nastiness or anger; leaving jobs in which they were being harassed; not interpreting sexist comments or uninvited sexual advances as flattering; and reporting offenders to persons in authority.

One subject mentioned frequently was that of the recent trials involving URI students. Among those who commented, particularly the students, the dominant (but not unanimous) feeling was of greater sympathy for the male defendants than the female plaintiffs. A second common theme was that one result of the trials and the verdicts was that it would certainly reduce the tendency to report assaults, to bring charges, and to prosecute.

Finally, a number of the women interviewed suggested solutions to the problem of sexual harassment on campus. These included: educational efforts

such as specific courses or special workshops for students and staff: freshman orientation sessions on the subject; clear, well publicized and efficient procedures regarding "what to do" if intimidated, bribed or assaulted; better campus lighting; a more responsive campus police force; and more consistent and serious security measures, including night managers on duty in all dorms.

Of the 27 men who volunteered to be interviewed, 7 indicated, when contacted, that they had nothing more to add to their survey responses or were no longer interested, 8 could not be contacted (phone disconnected, did not return messages, etc.), and 2 did not show up for their appointments. Interviews were conducted with the remaining 10 men.

These men differed in a number of important ways from the women who were interviewed. Only 2 were undergraduates, while the others were 2 graduate students, 3 administrators or staff persons, and 3 faculty. Ages ranged from 53 to 20, with the median age being 41.5.

Not only did the men differ from the women in terms of age and status but also in the kinds of issues they wished to discuss with the interviewers. For example, whereas only a few of the women mentioned the questionnaire (and those who did said it was a good one, or thought-provoking), 7 of the 10 men talked about it, 2 saying that the survey was very good, and 5 offering criticisms of it generally or of specific items. One faculty member felt the survey was a "bit one-sided" and did not sufficiently explore women's enticement of men. An administrator called the questionnaire "biased" because it made assumptions that men are aggressors and that women use their sex appeal. Criticism was directed specifically, by three men, at the attitude questions, which were called ambiguous, and answerable in two ways. One staff member was especially displeased with the question in which respondents were asked if there were any circumstances under which they might sexually assault someone if they were assured of no report and no

punishment; he felt it was a "loaded" question. In contrast, no criticisms of the survey were offered by the 27 women interviewed.

Like some of the women interviewed, some of the men believed that the issue of sexual harassment on the campus had been exaggerated and one administrator felt that this might have an adverse effect in causing people "to inhibit their natural inclinations." One undergraduate believed that a few isolated cases had been blown out of proportion by reporters and that URI is "no different than other places;" if anything happened at Brown, he said, "it would be hushed up."

None of the men reported incidents of harassment or assault that they personally had experienced and only one mentioned incidents that had occurred with friends or acquaintances. A graduate student talked about his reactions to hearing women demeaned in his presence. It's "hard to take," he said, "but I just try to ignore it. It's usually presented as a joke, but I think it goes too far." No one mentioned specific cases in which they or others had been offered sexual favors in exchange for some benefit they could provide. The men's comments were by and large either related to questionnaire items or to the issue of sexual harassment in general.

With respect to the latter, the views expressed included the following: many women invite sexual comments, etc.; we must separate violent criminal acts from socially obnoxious ones and not let the latter, which are minor, divert attention from the former; the issue of sexual harassment is definitely worthy of study; there is too much vandalism, immorality and foul language on the campus -- nobody should be hassled sexually or be led on; you have to "consider both sides", and that "some of the girls it has happened to are real sleazes;" people should respect others - that is the main issue; and most people who are not attuned to this subject do not see such behaviors as "whistling, ogling and cat calls as harassment," but as acceptable and

not serious.

Among the few men who said that harassment was a serious problem in our society generally and at URI, in particular, the following suggestions were made: people should be told directly that they are behaving offensively by the target of the offense or others who observe it - social means are better than legal means for handling non-criminal behavior; and raise people's consciousness by education and discussion so that they will come to understand the meaning and pervasiveness of sexism.

Concluding Remarks

Over nine hundred women and men from all areas of the university community took 30 or more minutes of their time to respond to a nine-page questionnaire dealing with material of a personal, emotional, and controversial nature. This number of respondents was almost half the number to whom questionnaires were sent and, in fact, constitutes 7% of the population of URI students, staff and faculty (in Kingston and Providence).

We know that in terms of university status our respondents correspond remarkably well to their respective proportions within the population, although young undergraduate women tended to be more responsive than their male counterparts, both in answering the surveys and in volunteering for interviews.

What we don't know is what those who did not respond would have said. This is, of course, a critical question in all survey research and one which cannot be answered with any definitiveness. We assume that those who responded to our survey were interested enough to do so, but had no special axes to grind and represented a variety of experiences, backgrounds, and points of view. Our data clearly indicate wide variation and heterogeneity. We did not, certainly, hear only from people with lurid stories to tell.

We must assume that our respondents generally told us the truth about themselves and their acquaintances, and that the number of those wishing for one reason or another to withhold information did not differ from the number of those who might have wished to exaggerate. All investigations which utilize anonymous questionnaires as their source of information must make essentially the same assumptions.

We hope that the information provided by our respondents will be thoughtfully studied, calmly discussed, and intelligently utilized. The data contained in this report provide us with information we need in order to assess the current state of affairs on our campus and to prepare sensible and humane strategies for making any changes that will be deemed necessary for improving the quality of campus life.

APPENDIX A

Assessment Task Group
Sexual Harassment Committee
University of Rhode Island
February 15, 1980

Dear URI Community Member:

Enclosed is a survey, prepared by a task group of the University's Sexual Harassment Committee, which is being sent to a randomly selected group of 15% of the entire University community. Your name was chosen entirely by chance and appears only on the envelope in which the survey was mailed. Your name cannot be associated with the completed questionnaire and you can be assured of absolute anonymity.

We have found that the entire questionnaire can be answered in about half an hour. We urge you to sit down in a quiet place, alone, and answer the questions honestly and carefully. We believe that you will find the questions interesting, challenging, and worth your time and effort.

The University needs your information and views in order to assess characteristics of our environment which are discussed by many but factually verified by few. We need to know whether persons in our community are experiencing sexual harassment, how seldom or frequently this occurs, and under what conditions. Your answers to all of the questions on the enclosed survey will make an important contribution to "getting the facts" about a sensitive and emotion-provoking subject. Please take the time to respond. A postage-free envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Please fill out the questionnaire completely, put it into the envelope provided, and mail it right away.

Because of the importance of "getting the facts" and surveying attitudes about sexual harassment on this campus, President Frank Newman has provided us with funds to pay for this mailing and for assistance in organizing, summarizing, and reporting the findings. Thank you in advance for your cooperation on this project.

Yours truly,

Task Group Members

Rod Crafts
Director of Student Relations

Bernice Lott
Professor of Psychology
Task Group Chairperson

Dale Howard
Student

Sr. Joan Mahoney
Catholic Chaplain

Wendy Howard
Student

Mary Ellen Reilly
Associate Professor and
Acting Chairperson of
Sociology/Anthropology

ASSESSMENT OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Cols.

5 A. Age

18 or younger	_____	39-43	_____
19-23	_____	44-48	_____
24-28	_____	49-53	_____
29-33	_____	54-58	_____
34-38	_____	59 or older	_____

6 B. Female _____ Male _____

7,8 C. University Status (Check only one)

Kingston Campus Undergraduate

- down-the-line commuter _____
- at-home commuter _____
- residence hall student _____
- sorority/fraternity resident _____

- Extension Division Undergraduate _____
- Graduate Student _____
- Technical Staff _____
- Clerical Staff _____
- Maintenance or Service Staff _____
- Professional Staff _____
- Faculty Member _____
- Administrator _____
- Other (specify) _____

9 D. How many years have you been at URI?

- Less than one _____
- 1-3 _____
- 4-6 _____
- 7-9 _____
- 10 or more _____

10 E. Marital Status (Check only one)

- Single (never married) _____
- Separated or divorced _____
- Widowed _____
- Married _____

Cols.

Questions F through J deal with sexual assault. Please read the following definition carefully before proceeding.

> Sexual Assault is defined as forced sexual contact without consent.
>
> Sexual contact is defined as touch or penetration of intimate body parts.
>
> Force is defined as use, or threatened use, of superior physical strength, violence, or, a weapon.
>
> Without consent is inferred from refusal or being helpless or incapacitated (e.g., under the influence of drugs or alcohol) or being under 13 years of age.

F. If you personally know any person(s) other than yourself, of either sex, who has been sexually assaulted (as defined above), on any U.R.I. campus (including an Extension Center), please note, for each instance of sexual assault, the sex of the victim, the sex of the assaulter(s), the number of assaulter(s), and the location in which the assault occurred. Otherwise, proceed to Question G.

Instances of forced or attempted touching of intimate body parts (genital or anal areas, groin, inner thigh or buttock, or breast of female), clothed or unclothed:

	Sex of Victim	Sex of Assaulter(s)	No. of Assaulter(s)	Location of Assault
11-14	_____	_____	_____	_____
15-18	_____	_____	_____	_____
19-22	_____	_____	_____	_____
23-26	_____	_____	_____	_____

(Use back of page 9 if more space is required)

Instances of forced or attempted penetration of vaginal, anal, or oral openings by any part of another person's body or by any object.

	Sex of Victim	Sex of Assaulter(s)	No. of Assaulter(s)	Location of Assault
27-30	_____	_____	_____	_____
31-34	_____	_____	_____	_____
35-38	_____	_____	_____	_____
39-42	_____	_____	_____	_____

(Use back of page 9 if more space is required)

Cols.

G. If you have been sexually assaulted on any U.R.I. campus, please note, for each instance of sexual assault, the sex of the assaulter(s), the number of assaulters, the specific location in which the assault took place, and the relationship of the assaulter(s) to you, e.g. stranger, date, acquaintance, teacher, resident of same living unit, etc. Otherwise, proceed to question H.

Instances of forced or attempted touching of intimate body parts (genital or anal areas, groin, inner thigh or buttock, or breast of female), clothed or unclothed:

	Sex of Assaulter(s)	No. of Assaulter(s)	Location of Assault	Relationship with Assaulter(s)
43-46	_____	_____	_____	_____
47-50	_____	_____	_____	_____
51-54	_____	_____	_____	_____

(Use back of page 9 if more space is required)

Instances of forced or attempted penetration of vaginal, anal, or oral openings by any part of another person's body or by any object.

	Sex of Assaulter(s)	No. of Assaulter(s)	Location of Assault	Relationship with Assaulter(s)
55-58	_____	_____	_____	_____
59-62	_____	_____	_____	_____
63-66	_____	_____	_____	_____

(Use back of page 9 if more space is required)

67 With whom did you talk about any of the above cited assaults?

_____, _____, _____, _____

(Use back of page 9 if more space is required)

H. If you have been sexually assaulted anywhere outside of URI at any time in your life, please note, for each instance of sexual assault, the sex of the assaulter(s), the number of assaulter(s), the specific location of the assault, and the relationship of the assaulter(s) to you, e.g. stranger, acquaintance, date, parent, other relative, physician, etc. Otherwise, proceed to Question I.

Cols.

H: Continued.

Instances of forced or attempted touching of intimate body parts (genital or anal areas, groin, inner thigh or buttock, or breast of female), clothed or unclothed:

	Sex of Assaulter(s)	No. of Assaulter(s)	Location of Assault	Relationship with Assaulter(s)
68-71	_____	_____	_____	_____
72-75	_____	_____	_____	_____
76-79	_____	_____	_____	_____

(Use back of page 9 if more space is required)

Instances of forced or attempted penetration of vaginal, anal, or oral openings by any part of another person's body or by any object.

	Sex of Assaulter(s)	No. of Assaulter(s)	Location of Assault	Relationship with Assaulter(s)
5-8	_____	_____	_____	_____
9-12	_____	_____	_____	_____
13-16	_____	_____	_____	_____

(Use back of page 9 if more space is required)

17-18 With whom did you talk about any of the above cited assaults?

_____, _____, _____.

(Use back of page 9 if more space is required)

19 I. If it was assured that you would not be reported or punished, are there any circumstances under which you might sexually assault another person?

Yes, many _____

Yes, some _____

Yes, but few _____

Perhaps, not certain _____

No _____

20 J. Have you ever forcibly and without consent sexually assaulted another person?

Yes _____ No _____

Cols.

Questions K through R deal with sexual intimidation. Please read the following definition carefully before proceeding.

> Sexual Intimidation is defined as a threat or bribe by a person in a position of authority to coerce sexual contact with another person, e.g. threat of a negative job criticism, of being fired, demoted, or receiving a poor grade in a course, or promise of a job, a promotion, a recommendation, a good grade, etc.

K. If you personally know of any person(s) other than yourself, of either sex, who has been sexually intimidated (as defined above) on any URI campus, please note, for each instance of sexual intimidation, the sex of the person intimidated, the sex of the intimidator, the nature of the threat or bribe, and the position of authority occupied by the intimidator (e.g. teacher, superviser, employer, etc.)

	Sex of Person Intimidated	Sex of Intimidator	Nature of Threat or Bribe	Position of Intimidator
21-24	_____	_____	_____	_____
25-28	_____	_____	_____	_____
29-32	_____	_____	_____	_____
33-36	_____	_____	_____	_____
37-40	_____	_____	_____	_____

(Use back of page 9 if more space is required)

L. If you have been sexually intimidated on any URI campus, please note, for each instance of sexual intimidation, the sex of the intimidator, the specific nature of the threat or bribe, and the position of authority occupied by the intimidator (e.g. teacher, superviser, employer, etc.)

	Sex of the Intimidator	Nature of Threat or Bribe	Position of Intimidator
41-43	_____	_____	_____
44-46	_____	_____	_____
47-49	_____	_____	_____
50-52	_____	_____	_____

(Use back of page 9 if more space is required)

M. Have you ever sexually intimidated any person at URI?

53 Yes _____ No _____

Cols.

54 N. Have you ever sexually intimidated any person anywhere?

Yes _____ No _____

55 O. If you are in a position of authority at URI, how frequently have you been offered sexual contact or sexual favors in exchange for some job related or school related benefit that you could provide?

very often _____

often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

(am not in a position of authority at URI _____)

56 P. If you have been in a position of authority elsewhere, how frequently have you been offered sexual contact or sexual favors in exchange for some job related or school related benefit that you could provide?

very often _____

often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

(have never been in a position of authority _____)

57 Q. At URI, how frequently have you offered sexual contact or sexual favors in exchange for a job related or school related benefit to yourself?

very often _____

often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

Cols.

58 R. Elsewhere, how frequently have you offered sexual contact or sexual favors in exchange for a job related or school related benefit to yourself?

very often _____

often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

Questions S through X deal with sexual insult. Please read the following definition carefully before proceeding.

Sexual Insult is defined as an uninvited sexually suggestive, obscene or offensive remark, stare, or gesture.

59 S. How frequently do you believe that men at URI receive sexual insults (as defined above)?

very often _____

often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

60 T. How frequently do you believe that women at URI receive sexual insults?

very often _____

often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

Cols.

61 U. How frequently have you personally been sexually insulted by an individual man or group of men at URI?

very often _____

often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

62 V. How frequently have you personally been sexually insulted by an individual man or group of men anywhere?

very often _____

often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

63 W. How frequently have you personally been sexually insulted by an individual woman or group of women at URI?

very often _____

often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

64 X. How frequently have you personally been sexually insulted by an individual woman or group of women anywhere?

very often _____

often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

Cols.

65 Y. How many times have you left a job or been forced to leave a job, anywhere, because of sexual threats, bribes, or insults? _____

66 Z. How many times have you dropped a course at URI because of sexual threats, bribes, or insults? _____

ZZ. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements by circling the appropriate number.

1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

67 1 2 3 4 5 Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act, or dress.

68 1 2 3 4 5 An attractive woman has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.

69 1 2 3 4 5 Most men are sexually teased by many of the women with whom they interact on the job or at school.

70 1 2 3 4 5 A man must learn to understand that a woman's "no" to his sexual advances really means "no".

71 1 2 3 4 5 Uninvited sexual attention by men to women students or employees helps to keep women in their place.

72 1 2 3 4 5 It is only natural for a woman to use her sexuality as a way of getting ahead in school or at work.

73 1 2 3 4 5 An attractive man has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.

74 1 2 3 4 5 I believe that sexual intimidation is a serious social problem.

75 1 2 3 4 5 It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive.

76 1 2 3 4 5 Innocent flirtations make the workday or school day interesting.

77 1 2 3 4 5 Encouraging a professor's or a supervisor's sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to improve their work situation.

Please comment below on this survey and on any of the subjects with which it has dealt. Thank you for your assistance.

If you would like to talk confidentially with someone about any of the issues raised in this survey call 792-2287. Ask for NANCY CARLSON, JUDY SCARFPIN or TEDDY ZUBRINSKI (if you are a woman), or GENE KNOTT or DOUG DAHER (if you are a man), and say that your call is about a sexual harrassment issue.

If you are willing to be interviewed on the general subject of this survey please send this page under separate cover to:

Bernice Lott
Psychology Department
Chafee/Campus

Your Name:_____

Your Phone # (daytime)_____ (evening)_____

APPENDIX B

State of Rhode Island, &c.

IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

JANUARY SESSION, A. D. 19 79

AN ACT

RELATING TO RAPE AND SEDUCTION.

It is enacted by the General Assembly as follows:

SECTION 1. Title 11 of the general laws entitled "Criminal offenses" is hereby amended by repealing chapter 11-37 in its entirety.

SEC. 2. Title 11 of the general laws entitled "Criminal offenses" is hereby amended by adding thereto the following chapter:

"CHAPTER 11-37

"SEXUAL ASSAULT

"11-37-1. Definitions. -

'Actor' - means a person accused of a sexual assault.

'Intimate parts' - includes the genital or anal areas, groin, inne thigh or buttock of any person or the breast of a female.

'Mentally defective' - means that a person suffers from a mental disease or defect which renders that person temporarily or permanently incapable of appraising the nature of his or her conduct.

'Mentally incapacitated' - means that a person is rendered temporarily incapable of appraising or controlling his or her conduct due to the influence of a narcotic, anaesthetic, other substance, or due to any other act committed upon that person.

'Physically helpless' - means that a person is unconscious, asleep or for any other reason is physically unable to communicate unwillingness to an act.

'Sexual contact' - includes the intentional touching of the victim or actors intimate parts, clothed or unclothed, if that intentional touch can be reasonably construed as for the purpose of sexual arousal, gratifi tion or assault.

'Sexual penetration' - means sexual intercourse cunnilingus, fellatio, and anal intercourse, or any other intrusion, however slight, by any part of a person's body or by any object into the genital or anal openings of another person's body, but emission of semen is not required.

'Victim' - means the person alleging to have been subjected to sexual assault.

'Spouse' - means a person married to the actor at the time of the alleged sexual assault, except that such persons shall not be considered the spouse if the couple are living apart and a decision for divorce has been granted, whether or not a final decree has been entered.

'Force or coercion' - includes, but is not limited to any of the circumstances listed:

(A) When the actor uses or threatens to use a weapon, or any article used or fashioned in a manner to lead the victim to reasonably believe it to be a weapon.

(B) When the actor overcomes the victim through the application of physical force or physical violence.

(C) When the actor coerces the victim to submit by threatening to use force or violence on the victim and the victim reasonably believes that the actor has the present ability to execute these threats.

(D) When the actor coerces the victim to submit by threatening to retaliate in the future against the victim or any other person and the victim reasonably believes that the actor has the ability to execute this threat. As used in this subdivision 'to retaliate' means threats of physical punishment or kidnapping.

"11-37-2. Definition of guilt of first degree sexual assault. - A person is guilty of first degree sexual assault if he or she engages in sexual penetration with another person, not the spouse of the actor, and if any of the following circumstances exist:

(A) The victim is under thirteen (13) years of age.

(B) The actor knows or has reason to know that the victim is mentally incapacitated, mentally defective, or physically helpless.

(C) The actor uses force or coercion.

(D) When the actor, through concealment or by the element of surprise, is able to overcome the victim.

(E) When the actor engages in the medical treatment or examination of the victim for the purpose of sexual arousal, gratification or stimulation.

"11-37-3. Penalty for first degree sexual assault. - Every person who shall commit sexual assault in the first degree shall be imprisoned for a period not less than ten (10) years to life.

"11-37-4. Definition of guilt of second degree sexual assault. - A person is guilty of second degree sexual assault if he or she engages in sexual contact with another person and if any of the following circumstances exist:

(A) The victim is under thirteen (13) years of age.

(B) The actor knows or has reason to know that the victim is mentally incapacitated, mentally defective or physically helpless.

(C) The actor uses force or coercion.

(D) When the actor engages in the medical treatment or examination of the victim for the purpose of sexual arousal, gratification or stimulation.

"11-37-5. Penalty for second degree sexual assault. - Every person who shall commit sexual assault in the second degree shall be imprisoned for not less than three (3) years and not more than fifteen (15) years.

"11-37-6. Definition of guilt of third degree sexual assault. - A 'person' is guilty of third degree sexual assault if he or she engaged in sexual penetration with another person over the age of twelve (12) years and under the age of consent, sixteen (16) years of age.

"11-37-7. Penalty for third degree sexual assault. - Every person who shall commit sexual assault in the third degree shall be imprisoned for not more than five (5) years.

"11-37-8. Penalty for assault with intent to commit first degree sexual assault. - Assault with intent to commit first degree sexual assault is punishable by imprisonment for not less than three (3) years or more than twenty (20) years.

"11-37-9. Joinder of first, second, third degree sexual assault, and pursuant to section 11-37-8. - Any person who shall be indicted for first, second, third degree sexual assault and/or section 11-37-8, may also be charged in the same indictment with either or all of the offenses described in sections 11-37-2, 11-37-4, 11-37-6, and 11-37-8, inclusive and if upon trial the jury shall

acquit such person on any of the charges of sexual assault and shall find him or her guilty of any of the other offenses, judgment and sentence may be entered against him or her accordingly.

"11-37-10. Subsequent offenses. - If a person is convicted of a second or subsequent offense under the provisions of sections 11-37-2, 11-37-4, or 11-37-8, the sentence imposed under these sections for the second or subsequent offenses shall not be less than twice the minimum number of years of sentence for the most recent offense.

"11-37-11. Corroboration. - The testimony of the victim need not be corroborated in prosecutions under this chapter.

"11-37-12. Resistance. - The victim need not resist the actor in prosecution under any of the circumstances listed in this chapter.

"11-37-13. Admissibility of evidence - Proof of prior sexual conduct of complainant. - If a defendant who is charged with the crime of sexual assault intends to introduce proof that the complaining witness has engaged in sexual activities with other persons, he shall give notice of his intention to the court and the attorney for the state. The notice shall be given prior to the introduction of any evidence of such fact; it shall be given orally out of the hearing of spectators and, if the action is being tried by a jury, out of the hearing of the jurors. Upon receiving such notice, the court shall order the defendant to make a specific offer of the proof that he intends to introduce in support of this issue. The offer of proof, and all arguments relating to it, shall take place outside the hearing of spectators and jurors. The court shall then rule upon the admissibility of the evidence offered.

"11-37-14. Severability. - If any provision of this chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or

applications of the chapter which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of the chapter are declared to be severable."

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect upon passage.